

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 68 are pending in the referenced application. Applicants note that Examiner has allowed claims 69 and 70 and thank the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 15, 18, 19, 20 - 22, 31, 32, 48-51, 55, 56, 67 and 68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on U.S. Patent No. 6,094,587 of Armanto et al. ("Armanto").

Claim 1 recites:

1. A mobile communication device comprising:

a telephony unit to process telephony signals and to receive a signal indicating an incoming call over a wireless link, the signal including Caller-ID information; **and**

a browser to enable a user to access and navigate hypermedia information, and further **to receive the Caller-ID information from the telephony unit in response to the incoming call** and, in response to receiving the Caller-ID information, to execute a predetermined action based on the Caller-ID information.

(Emphasis added.)

Armanto does not disclose or even suggest a telephony unit and a browser as components of a mobile communication device. Moreover, Armanto does not disclose or suggest that a browser in a mobile communication device can receive Caller-ID information from the telephony unit in response to the incoming call. The Examiner contends that this limitation is disclosed in Armanto at **Fig.2**, col.6, lines 12-27, and col.15 lines 28-33 (Office Action, pages 2-3, item 4). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Rather, Armanto describes a mobile station, which does not include a browser, and a separate PC, which does not include a telephony unit or a browser to receive

Caller ID information. (Armanto, **Fig. 2**). Armanto discloses that the PC may send short messages to a mobile station. The PC that is in connection with the Internet can download from the Internet, for the transmission of the short message, a WWW page, which can be, e.g., at the server GTW. On this WWW page, the user inputs the telephone number of the receiving mobile station MS2 and the message to be transmitted, whereupon the message can be sent from the PC. (Armanto, col. 6, lines 12-19).

Thus, the PC in Armanto, while including a browser to retrieve a web page, is not a mobile communication device, nor does it include a browser that receives Caller-ID information from the telephony unit, as is claimed by Applicant. Moreover, the PC, while able to send short messages, does not include a telephony unit. Furthermore, there would be no motivation, based on the disclosure of Armanto or the other art of record, to provide a browser executing a predetermined action in response to, and based on, Caller-ID information from a telephony unit.

Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Armanto, nor is it obvious based on Armanto. Independent claims 20, 31, and 50 recite limitations similar to those in claim 1 discussed above, and in at least some cases, additional limitations. Accordingly, these claims are also patentable over the cited art for similar reasons.

35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) Rejections

Claims 3, 28, 33, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent No. 6,094,587 of Armanto et al. ("Armanto") and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,637 of Kredo ("Kredo").

Claims 4, 5, 29, 30, 34, 35, 53 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Armanto and in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0009184 of Shnier ("Shnier").

Claims 8, 26, 38, 46, 57 and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Armanto and in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0194352 of Ho et al. ("Ho").

Claims 9, 27, 39, 47, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Armanto and in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0023371 of Stephens ("Stephens").

Claims 10, 11, 14, 15, 23 – 25, 40, 44, 59, 60, 63, and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Armanto and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,484 of Fleming, III ("Fleming").

Claims 12, 16, 42, and 61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Armanto and in view of Fleming and further in view of Ho.

Claims 13, 17, 43, 62, and 66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Armanto, in view of Fleming, and further in view of Stephens.

All of the dependent claims depend from one of the independent claims discussed above and therefore also include the distinguishing claim limitations. As a result, the dependent claims are also patentable.

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent

claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding the claim.


Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 12/02/2004



Naya Chatterjee
Reg. No. 54,680

Customer No. 26529
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300